UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JOHN D. TAYLOR,

Plaintiff,

v. Case No. 05-C-0505

MATTHEW J. FRANK,

Defendant.

**ORDER**

On May 6, 2005, John D. Taylor filed this petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, asserting that his state court conviction and sentence were imposed in violation of the Constitution. Petitioner was convicted in Racine County Circuit Court of Second Degree Intentional Homicide and First Degree Recklessly Endangering Safety and was sentenced to twenty-five years imprisonment. He is currently incarcerated at Fox Lake Correctional Institution.

I must give the case prompt initial consideration pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, which reads:

> If it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court, the judge shall make an order for its summary dismissal and cause the petitioner to be notified. Otherwise the judge shall order the respondent to file an answer.

Rule 4, Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. During my initial review of habeas petitions, I look to see whether the petitioner has set forth cognizable constitutional or federal law claims and exhausted available state remedies.

In his petition, Taylor raises two distinct claims: 1) that his sentence was improper based upon the sentencing court's reliance on inaccurate information contained within his presentence investigation report and 2) that his trial counsel was ineffective. More particularly, Taylor claims that his presentence investigation report contained information that he was twice convicted of unlawful use of a weapon; once in 1978 and again in 1991. This information according to Taylor was false, yet, the court relied on this information when formulating his current sentence. Taylor further claims that his trial counsel failed to provide him with an opportunity to read his copy of the presentence investigation report prior to sentencing. Had counsel done so, Taylor could have appraised the court of the inaccuracies and thus avoided his current "harsh" sentence.

Imposing a sentence based upon assumptions concerning a criminal record which are materially untrue can result in a violation of the due process of law. *Townsend v. Burke*, 334 U.S. 736, 741 (U.S., 1948). Likewise, ineffective assistance of counsel is clearly a constitutional ground for habeas relief under *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984). Thus, Taylor has presented at least colorable constitutional issues.

Regarding exhaustion, an application for writ of habeas corpus from a person in state custody shall not be granted unless it appears that (a) the applicant has exhausted state remedies, or (b) there is no available state corrective process or circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to protect the applicant's rights. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1). To exhaust a claim, the petitioner must provide the state courts with a full and fair opportunity to review his claims. *O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 845 (1999). A specific claim is not considered exhausted if the petitioner "has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(c). This requires the petitioner to appeal adverse state court decisions all the way to the state supreme court when doing so is part of the ordinary appellate

review procedure in that state. *O'Sullivan*, 526 U.S. at 847. The doctrine of exhaustion allows state courts the "initial opportunity to pass on and correct alleged violations of its prisoners' federal rights." *Wilwording v. Swenson*, 404 U.S. 249, 250 (1971) (internal quotation marks omitted). A petition for writ of habeas corpus should be dismissed if state remedies have not been exhausted as to any one of the petitioner's federal claims. *Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509 (1982); *Cruz v. Warden of Dwight Correctional Ctr.*, 907 F.2d 665, 667 (7th Cir. 1990).

In this case, Taylor appealed the issues now raised to both the Wisconsin State Court of Appeals and Supreme Court. However, it appears that the appeals were denied not on the merits but rather on procedural grounds.

The fact that the state courts held that his claims were barred on procedural grounds may prevent federal habeas review unless Taylor can demonstrate cause for his default and actual prejudice as a result of the alleged violation of federal law, or demonstrate that failure to consider his claims will result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice. *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 750 (1991). But because it is premature to decide that issue at this point, the case will proceed.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED** that within 30 days of the date of this order respondent answer the petition, complying with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, and showing cause, if any, why the writ should not issue.

**FURTHER, IT IS ORDERED** that unless respondent files a dispositive motion with its answer the parties shall abide by the following schedule regarding the filing of briefs on the merits of petitioner's claims: (1) petitioner shall have 45 days following the filing of respondent's answer within which to file his brief in support of his petition; (2) respondent shall have 45 days following the filing of petitioner's initial brief within which to file a brief in opposition; and (3) petitioner

shall have 30 days following the filing of respondent's opposition brief within which to file a reply brief, if any.

If respondent files a dispositive motion and supporting brief with its answer, this briefing schedule will be suspended and the briefing schedule will instead be as follows: (1) petitioner shall have 30 days following the filing of respondent's dispositive motion and supporting initial brief within which to file a brief in opposition; and (2) respondent shall have 15 days following the filing of petitioner's opposition brief within which to file a reply brief, if any.

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7.1(f), the following page limitations apply: briefs in support of or in opposition to the habeas petition or a dispositive motion filed by respondent must not exceed thirty pages and reply briefs must not exceed fifteen pages, not counting any statements of facts, exhibits, and affidavits.

Petitioner is advised that he must send copies of all future filings with the court to counsel for respondent. Until respondent files his or her answer, these copies should be sent to Gregory Weber at the address below.

Pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, copies of the petition and this order will be mailed to respondent and to the Attorney General for the State of Wisconsin, c/o Gregory M. Weber, Assistant Attorney General, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, WI 53707.

This district's form regarding magistrate judge jurisdiction should be included with copies of this order and returned by the parties as directed on that form.

Dated this 13th day of May, 2005.

s/ William C. Griesbach
William C. Griesbach
United States District Judge